DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 810 IR 009 402

AUTHOR Hochstadt, Peggy Wai Chee
TITLE Centralised and Decentralised University Library Services in Southeast Asia: A Survey.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 25p.: Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Federation of Library Associations (Manila, Philippines, August 18-23, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Centralization; *College Libraries; *Developing Nations; International Programs; *Library Administration; Library Associations; *Library Services; Library Surveys; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS *Asia (Southeast)

ABSTRACT

Data from 16 university libraries in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand are used to determine, but not evaluate, the variety and extent of library services offered by ASEAN university libraries in the context of their organizational operating modes. These libraries, representing 80 percent of those queried, responded to a survey questionnaire seeking basic statistical and administrative information and answers to questions designed to elicit the relative degree of centralization in the library system. Survey results are presented concerning collections, services, duplication of resources, accessibility, staffing, and funding, with answers to open-ended questions providing a subjective view of each libraries' administrative organization. The survey concludes with 17 findings that develop a continuum of centralized/decentralized operation. The survey questionnaire and four references are included. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208810

IFLA General Conference 1980

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: University Libraries and other
General Research Libraries

82/UN/6E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CENTRALISED AND DECENTRALISED UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SERVICES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: A SURVEY

by

Peggy Wai Chee HOCHSTADT
Chief Librarian
National University of Singapore
Singapore

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A.L. van Wesemael

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR009402

46th International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions Conference, Manila, 18th-23rd August, 1980

CENTRALISED/DECENTRALISED UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SERVICES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: A SURVEY

(A paper to be presented at the University Libraries Section)

By Peggy Wai Chee Hochstadt
Chief Librarian, National University of Singapore

The purpose of the survey is to obtain some general information on the present set-up of university library services in the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) region, within the context of centralisation/decentralisation. It is hoped that the data presented will serve as a helpful basis for discussion on the subject among participants at the University Libraries Section of the IFLA Conference at Manila.

METHODOLOGY

Information was obtained through a survey questionnaire[1] distributed to a total of 20 university libraries (5 in Indonesia, 5 in Malaysia, 4 in the Philippines, 2 in Singapore and 4 in Thailand).

A total of 16 libraries responded to the questionnaire in various stages of completeness, while 1 library returned it uncompleted. No returns were received from 3 libraries in Indonesia.[2] Libraries surveyed ranged in collection size from 50,000 volumes (Universitas Hasanuddin) to over 700,000 volumes (the Universities of Malaya, the Philippines and Singapore). The oldest library surveyed was established in 1905 (University of Singapore Library) while the newest was set up in 1973 (Universiti Pertanian). Coverage is comprehensive for Malaysia and Singapore (a total of 7 libraries) and selective for the rest.

The questionnaire is designed on the assumption that university library services are organised and administered along the lines of centralisation, decentralisation, or a combination of both. It also identifies and differentiates the group of libraries/book collections under the centralised administration of the university librarian from those set up and operated outside the administrative control of the university librarian. Hence, the questionnaire is accordingly divided into two parts, with PART I covering BASIC STATISTICS/INFORMATION on the library or library system administered by the university librarian; and

.../2

---

1. A set of the questionnaire is included in Appendix III.
2. A list of respondents is given in Appendix V.

PART II (ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION) subdivided in 2 Sections: Section A, covering LIBRARIES ADMINISTERED BY THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN OR THE CENTRAL LIBRARY and Section B, covering DECENTRALISED LIBRARIES/BOOK COLLECTIONS NOT ADMINISTERED BY THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN OR CENTRAL LIBRARY. Data gathered in Part II, Sections A and B are presented in tabulated form (wherever possible) and are attached to this paper as Appendix I and Appendix II.

It should be emphasized that the survey aims to find out the types of university library services that are provided in the Southeast Asian region at present, rather than to evaluate these services. However, "comments" sections have been liberally provided for respondents to express their opinions or provide clarification on aspects of their services that may have been omitted in the questionnaire or that a straight "yes/no" answer will not be entirely satisfactory.

LIBRARIES CENTRALLY ADMINISTERED BY THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN[3]

Information on libraries centrally administered by the university librarian was gathered according to the following features:

(a) Number of libraries within the system

(b) Number of buildings (physical locations) which accommodate the libraries

(c) Comparative sizes of the total library collections (excluding non-print material)[4]

(d) Accessibility (right of access)

(e) Organisation of services (subdivided under technical, reader, reprographic and media)

(f) Duplication of central library collection

(g) Union catalogue of holdings of all libraries/collections

Collection Size, Service Points and Physical Locations

Except for the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia and the Siriraj Medical Library (Thailand) which provide only one library service point each through their respective central libraries, the remaining 13 operate a system of libraries ranging from 2 housed in two separate buildings (Nanyang University Library) to 34 located in 4 separate buildings (the University of the Philippines) The average number of libraries per library system is 7 as compared with an average of 3 library buildings. On the other hand, 9 out

.../3.

3. See Appendix I for tabulated data
4. Statistics for non-print collections were obtained through Part I (basic statistics/information) of the questionnaire. However, for this study, it is not necessary to include them for analysis.

of 13 (2 did not respond to the query) of the systems surveyed (69.2%) operate not more than 5 libraries each. A comparison of the statistics suggests that the growth of a collection is independent of the number of service points (i.e. number of libraries) set up within the library system, as shown by the following table:

Library	No. of Libraries operated within the system	No. of buildings	Size of Collection (by volume)
MALAYSIA			
University of Malaya	4	3	719,537
Universiti Pertanian	3	3	110,000
PHILIPPINES			
De La Salle University	4	2	78,309
University of the Philippines	34	4	700,164
SINGAPORE			
University of Singapore	5	4	703,000
THAILAND			
Khon Kaen University	10	8	59,726

On the other hand, the number of libraries operated within a system seem to correspond more closely to the number of buildings (physical locations) housing these libraries. However, the University of the Philippines clearly shows that as many as 34 libraries may operate within 4 buildings.

.../4

Services

Apart from one-library systems such as the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia and Chulalongkorn University Central Library which centralise all their library services, the dominant service pattern seems to be one of centralised or a combination of centralised/decentralised technical services, and decentralised reader, reprographic and media services. Three libraries depart from this. The Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia decentralises its services in all its 3 libraries (one of which is in Sabah, East Malaysia). The De La Salle University, on the other hand, adopts a centralised system of all services even though it operates 4 libraries distributed in 2 buildings. This appears a rather puzzling set-up, unless its 3 libraries, apart from the central library, provide only decentralised reading facilities. However, the responding library did not provide any comments or elaboration on the organisation of its services. The Universitas Hasanuddin (Indonesia) which qualifies its 5 libraries as "reading rooms" also centralises both its technical and reader services.

The centralised/decentralised combination with respect to technical services varies with different libraries. For instance, within the University of Singapore Library System, technical services are centralised at the Main Library for material in the humanities, social sciences, science, engineering, architecture, accountancy and business administration. However, they are decentralised at the special libraries, namely, the Chinese, Medical and Law Libraries (located respectively in 3 different campuses). The University of Malaya Library however, centralises certain technical facilities such as printing, binding and microfilming services while decentralising physical processing of materials in its special libraries. The University of the Philippines, the largest system surveyed (with 34 libraries), while centralising the fundamental technical services, allows its unit libraries "to exercise flexibility to the extent of their respective needs." They may select and solicit free or exchange materials in the subject/s of their specialisation to complement the gifts and exchange programme of the centralised Acquisitions Section.

Most of the libraries do not offer reasons for the way their respective services are organised. The rationale put forth by some for centralising certain functions are countered by justifications forwarded by others for decentralising the same function. One large library states that economic reasons are responsible for the centralisation of facilities such as binding and microfilming at their main library. However, another puts forth speed, distance from the central library and lack of central library work space as justification for decentralising the same facilities. Commenting on their respective decentralised services, a number of libraries stress the importance of their maintaining some form of unity and control through the adoption by all libraries within the system of standardised library operations procedures (modified where necessary, to suit the individual needs of the decentralised libraries).

Duplication of Resources

Almost all libraries admit that duplication of resources in specific subjects either interdisciplinary (or taught in more than one department/faculty/campus) or for specific use (reference) is necessary but the extent should be monitored and checked by the central library through the maintenance of a union catalogue. Ten libraries report that they maintain a union catalogue of all library holdings for books, periodicals, non-print materials, theses and dissertations while 3 keep union catalogues which exclude non-print materials. In the one-library systems, the need for a union catalogue does not arise except of course in relation to the existence of collections/libraries outside the administration of the university librarian. (This will be treated in another section of this paper.)

Accessibility

Except in the University of the Philippines, all the libraries replied that their services were accessible to all students and staff of their parent institutions. The Librarian of the University of the Philippines explains that "23 are accessible to units located in the Diliman campus; 7 to those who are attached to units in Manila." "accessibility" here might have been interpreted as physical accessibility rather than the right of access.

Staffing

Eleven out of the sixteen libraries which responded to the questionnaire employ at least one professionally qualified librarian in each of the libraries within their respective system. The worst off seems to be Kasetsart University (Thailand) out of whose system of 9 libraries, only one (the Central Library) is staffed by professional librarians. Close behind Kasetsart is Khon Kaen University (Thailand) with only 4 libraries out of 10 employing at least one professional staff member.

The reasons for this, as far as the Thai libraries are concerned, are largely historical. In the case of Kasetsart, the Director of the Library explains that before December 1977, all faculty libraries were entirely independent from the Central Library which had no control over staffing. With the reorganisation of the library system, all faculty libraries came under the care of the Director of Libraries. Hence, one of the urgent aims of this central library is to centralise all staffing and to rotate qualified personnel to faculty libraries when necessary.

LIBRARIES/BOOK COLLECTIONS OUTSIDE THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OF THE LIBRARIAN

In general, the setting up of decentralised libraries outside the central administrative control of the University Librarian or Central Library is not currently encouraged by the respective university administration which recognises the importance of a central controlling and coordinating unit. However, for reasons such as the historical development of faculty/departmental/institute libraries, internal university politics, the powerful pressure from academic user groups as well as the crucial influence of key personnel (e.g. the Rector), the central libraries concerned and their respective university administration are either powerless or reluctant to step in to effect positive changes as, for instance, the integration of fragmented or heavily duplicated collections, the pooling of library manpower and the implementation of standardised coordinating procedures, even when they are obviously desirable. Moreover, the sheer enormity of the task in terms of time and manpower expended is enough to discourage the most lion-hearted of university librarians. The earlier established Thai libraries stand out in this predicament. However, it is heartening to note that respondents to the questionnaire who find themselves in this dilemma do make attempts towards coordinating the collections and services of these decentralised libraries. The extent of their effort and success depend very much on their staff situation and the response of the decentralised libraries.

Formal and informal measures taken include:

1. The maintenance of a union catalogue for at least the more significant faculty/departmental/institute libraries/ collections.
2. The appointment of a university library coordinating committee to work out the cooperative network of all libraries in the university.
3. The centralisation of the source of fund or staff allocation through the central library.
4. Extending services of the central library in the use of acquisitions and cataloguing tools and staff training, or in cataloguing, physical processing, interlibrary loan and reference services.
5. Cooperative bibliographical projects.
6. Requesting the faculty/departmental/institute libraries to submit lists of recommended titles to the central library before placing orders to avoid unnecessary duplication.

One or two who do not appear to be making any efforts towards even maintaining cooperative links with the faculty/ departmental/institute libraries tend to take the attitude of washing their hands off the faculty/departmental/institute libraries altogether since these are outside their administrative control. In contrast to this, one university librarian,

commenting on his own situation, writes,"We try to provide cataloguing services when we become aware of the existence of those collections which are frequently disguised under various names such as staff reading room, resource centre, studio, etc. If possible, we assign a clerk to look after the collection if the collection has become significant." Another comments that there should be "frank rapport between both sides in this matter. Hard-headedness on the part of each will inevitably lead to each going their separate ways. The university stands to lose here with the inevitable duplication of materials, space, staff and other facilities. A proper compromise needs to be effected whereby the main library should at least maintain a union list of holdings, offer centralised technical services (if possible - given sufficient staff and funds) and have access to the collections if any reader requires them. On the other hand, the faculty should keep only those materials that it requires, maintaining responsibility for the security of the collection and cooperating with the main library on matters that would arise from time to time."

Size of Faculty/Departmental/Institute Libraries/Collections

Due to the prevailing official policy of a centralised library administration in most universities, the majority of the university departments/faculties do not operate independent libraries offering the whole range of services. They maintain reading rooms and collections consisting often of donated titles and/or some basic reference titles. Three of the libraries surveyed report the existence of faculty/departmental/institute libraries with holdings exceeding 5,000 volumes - the Institute Teknologi Bandung with 4, the University of the Philippines with 7 and the Chulalongkorn University with 14 out of which 6 hold as many as 15,000-25,000 volumes. Five of the central libraries did not indicate the number of faculty/departmental/institute libraries/collections outside their control while a fair number ignored collections and reported only libraries.

Source of fund and staffing

Direct allocation of fund from the university administration or from an outside source channelled through the university is the most common financial support for faculty/departmental/institute libraries. A few also cite donation as another source of fund. The burden on the university administration must be tremendous when there is a proliferation of such decentralised libraries with collections beyond 10,000 volumes as in the case of Chulalongkorn.

On the question of staffing, 5 libraries reported that the decentralised libraries/collections outside their administrative control were not professionally staffed, while 7 did not provide information on this aspect. Both San Carlos (the Philippines) and Kasetsart (Thailand) report that only one of the decentralised faculty/institute libraries was professionally staffed while the Institut Teknologi Bandung (Indonesia) reported two out of a total of 24 decentralised libraries. Chulalongkorn (Thailand) reported the highest number of professionally staffed decentralised faculty/departmental/institute libraries - 14 out of 30. Understandably, it will also face the toughest challenge of integrating and/or establishing cooperative links and coordinating measures!

Accessibility and opening hours

Five libraries answered a straight "no" to the question if the decentralised libraries/collections outside the central administrative control opened after normal office hours while 4 replied that only some did. Two libraries said they did not know if the decentralised libraries opened outside office hours. The only library which gave an outright "yes" was San Carlos (the Philippines) which reported only 1 decentralised institute library outside its administration. As regards right of access by all staff and students of the university, 6 replied "no" and 6 replied "yes", with 4 not responding. Again, as in Part II(A), accessibility might have been interpreted by some respondents as physical accessibility.

Duplication of Central Library Collection and the Union Catalogue

Except for the Nanyang University (Singapore) and Kasetsart (Thailand), all could not give any assessment of the extent of duplication by the decentralised faculty/departmental/institute libraries of resources of the central library collection although some attempted to indicate the possible types of material that were or could be duplicated. Nanyang estimated 85% while Kasetsart 50% duplication respectively of their Central Library Collections. Only 5 central libraries maintain union catalogues of varying forms and degrees of comprehensiveness of holdings of the decentralised libraries outside their control.

Factors Contributing to the Establishment of Faculty/ Departmental Institute Libraries

Respondents were requested to rank in decending order (#1 being the most important) the following 6 factors which account for the establishment of faculty/departmental/institute libraries outside the administrative control of the University librarian or Central Library.

A. Historical reasons, e;g; the faculty/departmental libraries were set up long before the establishment of the central library.

B. The distance of the faculties/departments/institutes from the central library.

C. Donation with special conditions of attachment to the faculty/department/institute.

D. The special nature of the collection which requires it to be housed within the faculty/department/institute concerned.

E. The collection is tied to the availability of funds for faculty/department/institute research.

F. The influence of key personnel, e.g. the rector, vice-chancellor, dean or director.

Four libraries did not respond to the request at all while four responded partially by ticking off factors applicable to their institutions without ranking them.

Below is the comparative rating of respondents of the factors in terms of (1) ranked responses (the lowest aggregate being the most important) and(2) the total number of unranked responses (the highest aggregate being the most commonly cited factor)

---

5. A seventh factor was listed in the questionaire as "others (please specify)". However, only 1 respondent ticked this factor and gave it a ranking of "5" specifying it as "academic staff feeling strongly that they should have materials close at hand ehen needed".

FACTORS	RANKING	NO. of UNRANKED RESPONSES
A	11	6
B	16	8
C	25	10
D	18	9
E	19	7
F	12	8

(NOTE. Please see Appendix II, last column of the table for details of ranked and unranked responses)

If can be seen that FACTOR A: historical reasons, while rated as the most important, is also the least cited factor (6out of a total of 16 responses). The latter is probably due to the fact that the historical factor does not apply to a number of the institutions surveyed, e.g. to all the seven university libraries in Malaysia and Singapore, where no faculty/departmental/institute libraries were set up before the establishment of the central library. However, as far as their university libraries are concerned, the historical factor is one of the most signifigant ones contributing to the establishment and development of those decentralised libraries.

FACTOR F: the influence of key personnel, ranked as the second most cogent factor, with 8 libraries citing it as a contributing factor. The same number of libraries also cited FACTOR B: distance of the faculties/departments/institutes from the central library, as being relevant, although not as crucial. FACTOR C: donation with special conditions of attachment to the faculty/department/institute, while being the most frequently cited factor (with 10 unranked responses) was also ranked as the least signifigant. This is understandable as libraries within universities run solely on foundation or other philanthropic funds are surely uncommon, simply on account of the tremendous annually recurrent costs involved. Close behind C is FACTOR D: the special nature of the collection which requires it to be housed within the faculty/department/institute concerned, cited by 9 respondents but ranked fourth in importance. FACTOR E: the collection is tied to the availablility of funds for faculty/ departmental/institute research, is ranked both as the second least signifigant and second least cited factor (only 7 respondents cited it as a contributing factor).

Justification for Faculty/ Departmental/ Institute Libraries

University librarians responding to the questionnaires who ventured to comment on the establishment of faculty/departmental/ institute libraries are unanimous in emphasising that university policy should clearly stipulate that libraries within the university providing the whole range of services should be centrally

administered and that the central library administration should set up decentralised libraries or service units throughout the university campus/es wherever and whenever the need for these justifies their establishment. The more such decentralised libraries or service units are set up, the greater the need for the application of standardised operational procedures for the allocation of funds; for staff recruitment, training, supervision, development and deployment; and for the coordination of all aspects of university library service. Modifications of standardised procedures may be made in respect of each decentralised library in accordance with its special requirements and circumstances.

If one were to pursue this line of reasoning to its logical conclusion, there would be precious little justification for the establishment of faculty/departmental/institute libraries outside the administrative control of the University Librarian, except for those collections of reference titles and frequently consulted texts (kept to the essential minimum) which the various teaching/research units are allowed to purchase or keep (if they are donated). Yet, one cannot ignore the hard facts of reality, namely: political and religious forces (sometimes these two become one) within the country; internal university politics; the attitude and influence of key university personnel; and ad hoc governmental policies which may override any prevailing university policy. After all, if for instance, a university rector is inclined, convinced or determined to start a separate economics research library independent of the central library establishment, chances are that library will most likely materialise. Moreover, a central library administration may also get caught in a vicious circle through the proliferation of decentralised libraries to an extent where standardised procedures assume negative bureaucratic proportions, bogging down the speed and smooth running of normal services. Such a situation will build up academic pressures for library services independent of the central library administration.

It is quite futile trotting out the usual arguments against the establishment of faculty/departmental/institute libraries when the rationale for their existence lies outside fundamental cost considerations. A teaching department is primarily concerned with convenience - of having the most frequently referred or useful materials close at hand. As F.D.O. Fielding puts it, "it is difficult to convince (academics) that coordination of collections, access to a wider range of reference books and indexes, professional assistance from more senior library staff and an active approach to library service really promise benefits to compensate for the loss of a personalized fetch and carry service. Administrative arguments on the basis of unnecessary duplication, or the limitation of opening hours, or the expense of having professional staff spend much time on clerical work in comparatively small libraries, do not impress academic staff, and will be used as a basis for action by university administrators only when the balance of political forces which controls universities happens to create a propitious situation."[6]

... 12

---

6. F.D.O. Fielding, "University and College Libraries", in Design for diversity, ed. by Harrison Bryan and Gordon Greenwood (St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press, 1977), p.388.

University Librarians who are not faced with the historical handicap imposed by earlier established faculty/departmental libraries should ask themselves the question "How best to co-exist to the mutual benefit of the faculty libraries, the central library system and, most important of all, the university and related community who patronise all their services within the university and whose need for sources of information, whether in print or non-print form, has led to the existence of all university libraries in the first place?" The University Librarians must identify areas where cooperation and coordination can be mapped out and then proceed to convince their counterparts of the need for such cooperative linkages and measures. The extent to which such linkages are maintained or measures implemented will reflect the state of the financial and staffing resources as well as staff attitudes on both sides. It does not matter if total implementation is not achieved. What is important is to take that first step in the right direction, instead of taking the attitude of "to each his own". The automation of library procedures will certainly facilitate these cooperative efforts.

SUMMARY

1. This descriptive survey attempts to find out the patterns of library services prevailing in universities in the Southeast Asian region within the organisational framework of centralisation, decentralisation and the combination of centralisation/decentralisation in its various forms.

2. It also aims to delineate the features and gauge the extent of library services established and operated outside the unified library system under the administrative control of the University Librarian.

3. The survey was conducted through a pre-designed questionnaire distributed to 20 university libraries (5 in Indonesia, 4 in the Philippines, 5 in Malaysia, 2 in Singapore and 4 in Thailand) of which 16 responded. Coverage was comprehensive for Malaysia and Singapore and selective for the rest of the countries.

4. Libraries Under the Unified Library System

The survey indicates that:

(i) The number of libraries and/or service points established within the system is independent of the size of the total collection.

(ii) There is some correlation between the number of libraries and/or service points and the number of library buildings erected. However, the University of the Philippines Unified Library System shows that as many as 34 libraries may operate within 4 library buildings.

(ix) Of the factors listed as contributing to the development of faculty/departmental/institute libraries, the historical factor, when applicable, is the most crucial. The influence of key personnel is cited by 8 libraries and ranked as the second most important. The most commonly listed factor (with 10 unranked responses) is: donation with special conditions of attachment to the faculty/department/institute, but it is also ranked as the least significant. Other factors include: the distance of the faculties, etc. from the central library, the special nature of the collection which requires it to be housed within the faculties, etc., and the collection being tied to the availability of the funds of the faculty, etc.

(x) University Librarians responding to the survey, while holding the view that university library services should come under a unified library system under the central library administration, also have to face the hard facts of reality: the political and religious forces within the country, ad hoc government policies which may override university policies, the influence of key university personnel, academic user group pressures. Some of the newer central libraries where the historical factor does not apply are beginning to come under the pressures of one or more of these forces.

(xi) The extent to which University Librarians are able to establish and maintain cooperative links and coordinating measures for the mutual benefit of the university and related user community, the faculty/departmental/institute libraries and the unified library system will reflect the state of the financial and staffing resources as well as the staff attitudes on both sides.

****

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bryon, Harrison & Greenwood, Gordon (eds). "Design for Diversity". St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press, 1977.

Dunlap, Connie R. "Organizational Patterns in Academic Libraries, 1876-1976" College and Research Libraries 37, no.5, (September 1976): 395-407.

Lim, Huck Tee and Rashidah Begum (eds). "National and Academic Libraries in Malaysia and Singapore; Proceedings of a PPM & LAS Conference. Penang (Malaysia), Persatuan Perpustakaan Malaysia and Library Association of Singapore, 1975.

University Grants Committee (Gt. Brit.). Report of the Committee on Libraries. London, HMSO, 1967.

UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

LIBRARY

QUESTIONNAIRE ON CENTRALISED/DECENTRALIZED
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SERVICES
(April 1980)

PART I: BASIC STATISTICS/INFORMATION

Name of Library:

Year Founded:

Name of Chief Official:

Designation:

* Collection (please see note at end of Part I on page 2)

Books (by volume):

Current Periodicals (by title):

Nonbook materials (please specify unit):

Microfiche:

Microfilm:

Microprint:

Films:

Filmstrips:

Audio cassettes:

Video cassettes:

Slides:

Stereoscopic views:

Phonodics:

Others(please specify)

6. To what extent are the holdings of the Central Library duplicated in the decentralized libraries?

No duplication

only accidental duplication

Duplication of specific subjects or disciplines (please specify subjects or disciplines)

7. Are the subjects duplicated in Part II A (6) taught in more than one campus/faculty/department in the university?

YES NO

8. Does the Central Library in Part II A (1) maintain a Union Catalogue of holdings of all the decentralized libraries within the library system?

For Books	YES	NO
For Periodicals	YES	NO
For Nonbook Materials	YES	NO
For Theses	YES	NO

9. Can you suggest improvements in the library service administered by the University Librarian or Central Library (i.e. either further measures toward centralization, decentralization or any other type of organization) if you feel these are necessary? (USE A SEPARATE SHEET OF PAPER IF NECESSARY)

* Annual accessions (by volume):

* Membership:

*Loans (annual)

General loans:

Reserve book loans:

Nonbook loans:

* Staffing

	Full-time	Part-time
Professional librarians (including those working towards a professional library qualification)		
Professional non-librarians(e.g. programmer, systems analyst, bibliographers)		
Supportive (secretarial, clerical, technical, attendants, cleaners, etc)		

*NOTE. If the library system administered by the University Librarian or Central Library consists of more than one library, the statistics provided should cover all the libraries within the system. If this is not possible, please specify the particular library/ libraries covered, e.g. "statistics cover the Central or Main Library only"

PART II: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Libraries Administrered by the University Librarian or the Central Library (responsible to a Library Committee or Similar Body)

1. No. of libraries with the unified system

2. No. of libraries in Part II A (1) serviced by at least one professionally qualified librarian

3. How many of the libraries in Part II A (1) are housed in separate buildings?

4. Are all libraries in Part II A (1) accessible to the staff and students of all Faculties/ Institutes/Schools of the University

   YES NO

   If "NO", please specify the number that are accessible to all:

5. Please tick off (✓) the type/types of services provided by the libraries administrered by the University Librarian or Central Library (Part II A (1)):

   (a) Centralized technical services

   (b) Centralized readers services

   (c) Decentralized technical services

   (d) Decentralized readers services

   (e) Centralized media and/or reprographic services

   (f) Decentralized media and/or reprographic services

   (g) Others (Please specify)

B. Decentralized Libraries/Book Collections Not Administered by the University Librarian or Central Library

1. Total no. of libraries/book collections in the University:

2. Types of libraries/book collections in Part II B (1) (please tick off):

Faculty library/collections

Departmental library/collection

Institute library/collection

Others (please specify):

3. Are funds for the libraries/book collections in Part IIB (1) allocated:

Directly to the Faculties, Institutes, Departments?

Through a central source such as the Library or Finance Committee

Other means (please specify)

4. Average size of collections in Part II B (1)

	No. of libraries
(a) Under 500	_____
(b) 501-5,000 volumes	_____
(c) Over 5,000	_____

5. No. of libraries/collections in Part II B (1) that are serviced by at least one professional librarian or related personnel (e.g. bibliographer, documentalist, etc.)

6. Are the resources and services of libraries in Part II B (1) accessible to staff and students of all faculties/schools/ institutes in the University ?

YES NO DON'T KNOW

If "NO", please specify the number that are accessible to all:

7. Are the libraries/book collections in Part II B (1) accessible after normal office hours? (please specify number)

YES SOME DON'T KNOW

8. To what extent are holdings of the Central Library duplicated in the libraries/book collections in Part II B (1)? Please comment on this duplication, if any)

9. Does the Central Library maintain a Union Catalogue of holdings of all/some of the libraries/book collections in Part II B (1)?

YES NO

IF SOME LIBRARIES ARE MAINTAINED THIS WAY please specify the number.

10. Apart from (9), please describe or list the measures (if any) taken to coordinate any of the collections and services of the libraries in Part II B (1) with those of Part I A (1) - i.e. libraries administered by the University Librarian or Central Library (Use separate sheets, if nexessary)

11. (a) Please tick off (✓) from the following, factors which may account for the establishment and development of the libraries/ book collections in Part IIB(1).

(b) Please rank the factors (no. 1 being the most important)

- ☐ Historical reasons (e.g. the faculty/departmental libraries were set up before the establishment of the Central Library)
- ☐ Distance of faculty/departmental/institute libraries from the Central Library
- ☐ Donation with special conditions of attachment to the faculty/institute/department
- ☐ Special nature of the collection which require it to be housed within the faculty/institute/department concerned.
- ☐ The collection is tied to the availability of funds for faculty/institute/departmental research
- ☐ Influence of key personnel (e.g. the rector, vice-chancellor, dean or director)
- ☐ Others (please specify):

12. To what extent do you feel the decentralisation of library services outside the administration of the University Librarian or Central Library is justifiable or feasible?

..../10

13. Where decentralization is, in your opinion, unjustifiable can anything be done to improve the situation?

14. If you answer question 13 in the negative, please give the reasons or problems which impede measures to improve the situation.

15. In the context of your University, what are the negative effects of decentralized library services outside the administrative control of a central coordinating authority such as the University Librarian or Library Committee

Name of respondent_____

Signature_____

designation_____Date_____

UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

L I B R A R Y

Questionnaire on Departmental Library Collections in the University of Singapore (April 1980)

Please complete either Section 1 or Section 2 below by ticking off (✓) the appropriate boxes wherever applicable.

SECTION 1

☐ We do not maintain a departmental library collection but depend entirely on the University Library System for library resources (books, journals and non-book materials)

SECTION 2

The size of the departmental library collection is approximately:

Books: ☐ Below 500 volumes ☐ 500-1,000 volumes ☐ Over 1,000 volumes (please specify if possible)

JOURNALS (please specify no. of titles): ☐

THESES/ PROJECT REPORTS: ☐ Below 500 volumes ☐ 500-1,000 volumes ☐ Over 1,000 volumes (please specify if possible)

The annual expenditure on resources for the departmental library collection:

☐ Does not exceed $500

☐ Exceeds $500 (please specify amount, if possible)

The departmental library collection is available:

☐ Mainly to staff and students of the department

☐ Staff and students of all Departments of the University

The departmental library collection is open:

☐ During normal office hours

☐ Outside normal office hours

☐ The departmental library collection is not managed by a qualified librarian

☐ We order a title for the departmental library collection when required without checking the University Library catalogues for their holdings

Comments (please use a separate sheet if necessary)

Name of respondent:_____

Signature:_____

Department:_____

Date:_____

P.S. Please return completed questionnaire by 30th April 1980 to:

Mrs. Peggy Hochstadt
Librarian
University of Singapore Library
Bukit Timah Campus
Singapore 1025

Thank you.

PWCH/llc

21st April 1980